DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 446 717 HE 033 572

AUTHOR Terrell, Lavern; West, Russell
TITLE Assessing the Racial Awareness of Majority Group Member Students at East Tennessee State University and the Factors Related to Racial Awareness.
PUB DATE 2000-11-16
NOTE 29p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association (Bowling Green, KY, November 15-17, 2000).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Students; Higher Education; *Racial Attitudes; Racial Relations; State Universities; *Student Attitudes; Student Characteristics; Whites
IDENTIFIERS *East Tennessee State University

ABSTRACT

This study examined the racial attitudes of 395 White students in 24 undergraduate classes at East Tennessee State University. The Oklahoma Racial Attitudes Scale (ORAS) was administered as well as a demographic questionnaire. The ORAS is based upon the construct that White racial awareness is characterized by four categories of ethnic identity as defined by the presence, absence, or consideration of two variables: exploration of one's ethnicity and commitment to one's ethnic group. Achieved White racial consciousness may include four types of attitude clusters from dominative to integrative. Unachieved racial attitudes are those avoidant, dependent, or dissonant attitudes that are not securely integrated into the individual's belief system. Results ihdicated a wide range of racial awareness attitudes with most students having an "Achieved" level of racial awareness. The largest number of students in the "Achieved" racial awareness category expressed reactive attitudes (believing White society wrongly benefits from and promotes discriminatory practices). However, 17 percent expressed dominative attitudes (believing Whites to be superior to other groups). Higher levels of family income were related to development of conflictive or dominative attitudes. Minority composition of the high school was not related to racial awareness attitudes. (Contains 15 references.) (DB)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 446 717

ASSESSING THE RACIAL AWARENESS OF MAJORITY GROUP MEMBER STUDENTS AT EAST TENNESSEE STATE UNIVERSITY AND THE FACTORS RELATED TO RACIAL AWARENESS

Lavern Terrell and Russell West
East Tennessee State University

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
L. Terrell
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association
Bowling Green, Kentucky
November 16, 2000

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

HE033578

INTRODUCTION

A 1998 survey of American voters revealed that 69% agree that "courses and campus activities that emphasize 'diversity and diverse perspectives' have more of a positive rather than negative effect on the education of college students" (Ford Foundation, 1998, p. 3). Additionally, the study indicated that 67% viewed "preparing people to function in a more diverse society" as a "very important" goal of higher education and 69% viewed "preparing people to function in a more diverse work force" as another "very important" goal of higher education (National Survey of Voters, 1998, p. 3).

In 1995 East Tennessee State University (ETSU), in an effort to demonstrate its commitment to diversity, revised its mission and value statement and its general education core curriculum to address several issues, among which was the issue of diversity. The revisions were a first step in the process of implementing an emphasis on multicultural education into the curriculum of ETSU. Supporters of diversity have the hope that students will become multiculturally competent, i.e., they will have an awareness of their own heritage, knowledge of others' heritage, and finally, the skills to interact in a tolerant, respectful, and accepting way with those from whom they differ.

Racial awareness is one of the most important elements in the implementation of a diversity program into the university setting. As the first step of multicultural competence, it is the platform, which supports the other aspects of multicultural competence. If individuals are not racially aware, are not aware of and understand their own race and background and what that implies in relation to those who are different then, it is difficult for those individuals to understand others.

In light of support for diversity education, it is important to first identify the extent to which the university students understand themselves and tolerate and appreciate others from whom they differ. To that end, the purpose of this study is to: (1) Describe the level of racial awareness of majority group member students at ETSU and (2) Identify factors that are related to racial awareness. A total of seven research questions served to guide this study.

The Stages of Multicultural Development

As a result of the multicultural education movement during the 1970s that stressed inclusion and equality for all people, psychologists began to search for a means to assess the multicultural

development and competency of counselors who would provide mental health services and intervention strategies to minorities (Helms, 1996). Later, the need for multicultural development and competency was applied to educators responsible for teaching students of varying cultures and finally to students who themselves were learning of others from whom they differed (Choney & Behrens, 1996). The literature suggests that there are three stages of multicultural development through which students must pass in order to become multiculturally competent: (1) awareness (of his/her own assumptions about human behavior, values, biases, preconceived notions, and personal limitations), (2) knowledge (of the worldview of persons who are culturally different without negative judgment), and skills (actively practicing appropriate, relevant, sensitive teaching and intervention strategies when dealing with individuals who are culturally different) (Burnstein & Cabello, 1989; Pedersen, 1988; Sue & Sue, 1990). Pedersen (1988) wrote that, "awareness is the beginning of change" (p. 1). Indeed, each competency must proceed directly from the one that came before. In other words, awareness must be acquired first. Only after one has awareness of one's own culture may one begin to acquire knowledge of other cultures. One then uses knowledge to develop skills for use when interacting with students of other cultures. When psychologists delved into the dimensions of multicultural competency, particularly the dimension of awareness, they began to examine how an individual develops his/her racial awareness and identity.

A General Theory of the Development of Racial Identity Awareness

In the early 1970s, theories of racial identity development began to appear in the psychological literature in the United States. At that time, theories dealt with the development of Black racial identity (Carter, 1996; Helms, 1996). Models such as those presented by Cross (1978) and Thomas (1971) were stage models that suggested that individuals progressed from one stage to another in a linear fashion (Carter, 1996). In her overview of models that address the development of racial or ethnic identity, Helms (1990) has since located 11 models for African Americans, six for White Americans, two for Asian Americans, two for Latino/Hispanic Americans, and four for Native Americans (Helms, 1996). These also were stage models.

Though they differ in the number and name of each stage, all of the models follow a similar format. The first stage involves acceptance of the stereotypes the dominant group has attributed to the minority group. The second stage is one of dissonance in which the individual begins to question the

previously held stereotypes. The third stage involves an immersion in the culture of the minority group and a militant rejection of the values and attitudes of those who differ from the minority group. The final stage is one in which the individual not only accepts his/her own racial/ethnic identity, but the individual is also able to accept positive attributes of individuals outside of his/her own group (Rowe, Bennett, & Atkinson, 1994). In general, theorists who developed these stage models tended to assume that individuals moved through each stage in a linear, lock-step manner but, as Carter (1996) noted, today theorists have revised their thinking and their theories asserting that individuals can move back and forth between stages or levels in a more fluid fashion depending upon what they are experiencing at the time.

Development of the ORAS-P

The Oklahoma Racial Attitudes Scale Preliminary Form (ORAS-P), an instrument designed to assess White racial awareness, is based upon the construct that White racial awareness is "the characteristic attitudes held by a person regarding the significance of being White and what that implies in relation to those who do not share White group membership" (Bennett, Atkinson, & Rowe, 1993, p. 3). The types of White racial attitudes examined in the ORAS-P were adapted from Phinney's (1989) stages of ethnic identity. According to the model, four categories of ethnic identity were defined by the presence, absence, or consideration of two variables: exploration of one's ethnicity and commitment to one's ethnic group (Choney & Behrens, 1996).

Choney and Behrens (1996) wrote that when considering White racial consciousness, one could have attitudes that show (a) neither exploration nor commitment to one's racial/ethnic heritage, called Avoidant; (b) commitment to some racial/ethnic view or idea, called Dependent; or (c) an emphasis on exploration but no commitment to any specific racial/ethnic view, called Dissonant. These types of racial consciousness are considered to have an Unachieved status because they are not securely integrated into the individual's belief structure and they lack one or both of the necessary variables: exploration and commitment. Individuals with Avoidant (av) type attitudes have a lack of concern for issues that relate to racial and/or ethnic minorities and they tend to ignore, minimize, or deny the existence or importance of minority concerns (Rowe, Bennett, & Atkinson 1994). Dependent (de) type attitudes are characterized by the individual's dependence on others to determine his/her opinions. Individuals with dependent racial attitudes "appear to have committed to some set of attitudes regarding White racial consciousness, but

they have not personally considered alternative perspectives" (Rowe et al. p.136). Individuals with Dissonant (di) type attitudes are uncertain about their opinions related to racial/ethnic or minority issues and appear to be in transition (Choney & Behrens, 1996). According to Rowe et al., individuals with Dissonant attitudes appear to be searching for information that would help them resolve the dissonance created by "the conflict of previously held attitudes and recent experiential incidents" (p. 137). Of course, individuals cannot only be characterized as having an Unachieved status or racial consciousness; they may also have what is called an Achieved White racial consciousness status. Persons with Achieved White racial consciousness have attitudes that show exploration of and commitment to racial/ethnic related ideas.

Achieved White racial consciousness is represented by four types of attitude clusters described below:

1. Dominative attitudes are" those held by persons who have strong ethnocentric perspectives which justify the oppression of minority people by members of White society" (Choney & Behrens, 1996, p. 227). Rowe et al. (1994, p.138) described those individuals as having an "almost exclusive reliance on and reference to common negative stereotypes".
2. Conflictive attitudes are held by persons who are "opposed to obviously discriminatory practices yet are also opposed to programs designed to reduce or eliminate such discrimination" (Choney & Behrens, 1996, p. 228). Individuals exhibiting these attitudes may present reasons for their actions and attitudes that do not appear racist; however, "it might be inferred that their attitudes toward visible racial/ethnic groups have a negative valence compared to their attitudes toward Whites and whiteness" (Rowe et al. 1994, p. 139).
3. Reactive attitudes are held by persons who believe that White society wrongly benefits from and promotes discriminatory practices and react to the inherent injustice. These individuals may over identify with a minority group, romanticizing aspects of the minority culture and try to give minorities assistance based on a Euro-centric perspective (Choney & Behrens, 1996).
4. Integrative attitudes are described as those attitudes held by individuals who "neither idealize nor oppress minority groups and who do not respond out of anger or guilt about being White" (Choney & Behrens,

1996, p. 228). Those individuals seem "comfortable with their whiteness and comfortable interacting with visible racial/ethnic minority people" (Rowe et al. 1994, p. 141).

METHODS

A causal-comparative research design was used in this study, in which an assessment, the Oklahoma Racial Attitudes Scale-Preliminary Form (ORAS-P), was administered to majority group members at ETSU in order to determine their racial awareness. Once students' levels of racial awareness were determined, t-tests, ANOVA and hierarchical multiple regression analysis were used to determine whether or not there were relationships between racial awareness and the following factors: (1) White students contact with minority students, (2) The nature of the contact (whether it was perceived as positive or negative), (3) The socioeconomic status of the White students, (4) The high school the White students attended, and (5) White students participation in General Education Core classes having a diversity component.

Population and Sample

The target population for this study consisted of all White students enrolled in classes taught on the main campus of ETSU and its satellite campuses during the fall semester, 1999. An examination of enrollment data from fall, 1998 indicated that from a total of 9,623 undergraduates, 8,518 students identified themselves as White, non-Hispanic (East Tennessee State University, 1999).

A stratified random cluster technique was used to select the sample of students participating in this study. This technique was used in order to insure that all four undergraduate levels (Freshman, Sophomore, Junior, and Senior) were sampled. Approximately 9000 White students were projected to enroll in ETSU for fall, 1999. Forty-six classes (totaling1151 students) were asked to complete the survey in an effort to over-sample. Some instructors declined to participate in the study. Therefore the survey was administered to 24 classes (totaling 395 students). Two research assistants administered the ORAS-P and the demographic questionnaire to students who were required to complete them during class.

Instrumentation

The ORAS-P contains 50 items designed to reflect the types of White racial consciousness proposed in the theory of Rowe et al. (1994) described previously. Responses are ranked on a Likert

type scale ranging from 1 (Strongly disagree) to 5 (Strongly agree). The number of subscale items are as follows: 3 items each for avoidant (av) and dependent (de) scales, four items for the dissonant (di) scale, 7 items for the dominative (D) scale, and 8 items each for the conflictive (C), reactive (R), and integrative (I) scales. Consequently, the range of possible scores is 3 to 15 (av and de scales), 4 to 20 (di scale), 7 to 35 (D scale) and 8 to 40 (C R and I scales) (Choney & Behrens, 1996). The scale specifications are shown in Table 1.

TABLE 1
RACIAL ATTITUDE STATUSES AND TYPES, SUBSCALE ITEMS, AND CRONBACH ALPHAS FOR EACH TYPE

Attitude Status And Type	Subscale Items	Range of Scores	Alpha
Unachieved Status			
Avoidant	av1, av2, av3	3-15	.68
Dependent	de1, de2, de3	3-15	.82
Dissonant	di1, di2, di3, di4	4-20	.75
Achieved Status			
Dominative	D1, D2, D3, D4, D5, D6, D7	7-35	.77
Reactive	R1, R2, R3, R4, R5, R6, R7, R8	8-40	.80
Conflictive	C1, C2, C3, C4, C5, C6, C7, C8	8-40	.72
Integrative	I1, I2, I3, I4, I5, I6, I7, I8	8-40	.79

The LISREL (Linear Structural Relationships) computer program for structural equation modeling and exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses was used by to test and confirm the construct validity for the seven subscales.

The reported Alpha Coefficients for each subscale are as follows: .68 (av), .82 (de), .75 (di), .77 (D), .80 (R), .72 (C), and .79 (I).

Participants for all ORAS-P administrations in the development stage were White undergraduate students enrolled in a basic psychology class or in undergraduate educational psychology classes at an Oklahoma university. Four hundred ninety-six participants were included in the initial analysis with 364, 479, 379, 386, and 249 included in subsequent iterations.

Demographic Questionnaire

Participants were also asked to report demographic information such as age, race, home town, home state, high school graduated, parents occupation and highest level of education, classification,

courses taken from the General Education Core Curriculum having a diversity component, and if they have had contact with minorities and the nature of that contact (positive or negative).

Data Analysis

When administration of the ORAS-P was complete, the surveys were numbered from 1 to 395, and the data were entered chronologically into the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) computer program for analysis.

RESULTS

Research Question One

What are the characteristics of students who responded to the survey?

The sample of students represented a broad cross-section of the ETSU student population. The majority of students were female (n=254 or 64.3%), while males made up a much smaller portion of the sample (n=141 or 35.7%). The average age of the respondents was 22.9, with the youngest being 17 and the youngest 57.

The respondents reported a wide range of backgrounds in terms of family SES. The majority of students reported family incomes between $30,000 and $60,000. Eight respondents (2.2%) reported family incomes of less than $10,000, while 33 (9.2%) reported incomes of more than $100,000. When asked about the minority composition in their high schools, students gave a range of responses. The average percent enrollment in the feeder high schools was 7.3

The largest number of students came from the senior class (n=161 or 41.6%). The second largest group consisted of juniors (n=106 or 27.4%). Sophomores (n=67 or 17.3%) and freshmen (n=53 or 13.7%) made up a smaller proportion of the sample. . The average percent of minority enrollment in students' high schools was 7.3, although the percentage varied from 0% to 66%. The average number of diversity-focused core courses taken by respondents was 4.7, with the fewest 0 and the most being 13.

Research Question Two

What level of racial awareness exists among the White students at East Tennessee State University? Results from the ORAS-P are shown in Table 2.

TABLE 2

ETSU STUDENTS' RACIAL ATTITUDES BY FREQUENCY, PERCENT, AND STATUS

Racial Attitudes	Frequency	Percent	Status
Dominative	66	16.9	Achieved
Conflictive	62	15.9	Achieved
Reactive	82	21.0	Achieved
Integrative	78	19.9	Achieved
Conflictive/Dominative	11	2.8	Achieved
Conflictive/Integrative	4	1.0	Achieved
Dominative/Conflictive	9	2.3	Achieved
Dominative/Reactive	4	1.0	Achieved
Integrative/Conflictive	16	4.1	Achieved
Integrative/Reactive	12	3.1	Achieved
Reactive/Dominative	5	1.3	Achieved
Reactive/Integrative	9	2.3	Achieved
Dissonant	5	1.3	Unachieved
Inconsistent	19	4.8	Unachieved
Unachieved	6	1.5	Unachieved
Undifferentiated	3	0.8	Unachieved
Total	357	100.0	

Results from the ORAS-P showed that 66 students or 16.9% had Dominative type attitudes, indicating a belief that Whites are superior to minorities and their superiority justifies oppression of minorities (Rowe et al. 1994). Additionally, students with Dominative type attitudes tend to believe in "common negative stereotypes" in relation to minorities (Rowe et al. p.138). Sixty-two students (15.9%) expressed Conflictive attitudes toward minorities. Students with Conflictive type attitudes are opposed to obvious discriminatory practices, but are also opposed to programs designed to reduce or eliminate such practices. Individuals in this group would not say they are racist, however, they have more positive beliefs about Whites than they do about minorities (Rowe et al. 1994).

The group containing the highest percentage of students (82 or 21%) was characterized as having Reactive attitudes toward minorities. Students with Reactive type attitudes recognize that White society wrongly benefits from discrimination against and oppression of minorities and as such, feel guilty about being White (Rowe et al., 1994). In fact, they may romanticize minority cultures and over identify with them, often adopting aspects of minority cultures for themselves (Rowe et al.). According to Rowe et al. when individuals in this group try to help minorities, they often make the mistake of trying to help based on a Euro-centric perspective.

Almost 20% of students expressed Integrative attitudes. Students with Integrative type attitudes do not oppress or romanticize minorities nor do they feel guilty about being White (Rowe et al., 1994). They are "comfortable with their whiteness and comfortable interacting with visible racial/ethnic minority people" (Rowe et al., p.141).

A number of students were characterized as having dual racial attitudes. For various reasons, other students had Avoidant, Dependent, or Dissonant type attitudes that are categorized as Unachieved Racial Status. Five students (1.3%) were experiencing dissonance meaning they were uncertain about their attitudes related to racial and/or ethnic minorities. This type appears to be searching for information to help resolve the dissonance "generated by the conflict of previously held attitudes and recent experiential incidents" (Rowe et al., 1994, p.137). Nineteen students (4.8%) were inconsistent in their survey responses, 3 (.8%) gave responses that were considered to be undifferentiated (the information given was insufficient to determine the status), and 6 (1.5%) students identified as "unachieved" expressed attitudes that were a combination of Avoidant (marked by a lack of concern or interest about minority related issues), Dependent (marked by dependence on others to determine one's opinions) and Dissonant (Behrens & Rowe, 1993).

Research Question Three

Is there a significant difference in the racial awareness of White Students who have had positive, negative, or no contact with minorities?

Three hundred eighty-eight students responded to the survey question: "Have you at some point in your life, had contact with (had a class with, lived next to etc.) someone of a different race than you?" Three hundred eighty-six students indicated that they have had contact with someone of another race. Only two respondents indicated they had not had contact with someone of another race. Given the small number of students who reported no contact with minorities, no comparisons of means (contact versus no contact) were performed. However, the t-tests for independent groups procedure was performed in order make comparisons between the two groups on positive and negative contact.

TABLE 3
COMPARISON OF MEANS ON THE ORAS-P CONFLICTIVE, DOMINATIVE, INTEGRATIVE AND REACTIVE SCALES (RAW SCORES) BY POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE CONTACT WITH MINORITIES

Scale	Contact	n	M	SD	t	p
Conflictive	Positive:	359	27.29	5.50	-4.67	.00
	Negative:	13	34.46	3.10		
Dominative	Positive:	359	13.33	4.41	-6.15	.00
	Negative:	13	21.00	4.67		
Integrative	Positive:	359	34.08	4.33	8.31	.00
	Negative:	13	23.54	7.90		
Reactive	Positive:	359	18.09	4.61	2.58	.01
	Negative:	13	14.77	2.65		

The results of the t-tests indicated there was a difference in the group means on the ORAS-P Conflictive, Dominative, Integrative, and Reactive scales. Specifically, students who expressed Conflictive and Dominative type attitudes had less positive contact with minorities than students with Integrative and Reactive type attitudes.

TABLE 4
COMPARISON OF MEANS ON THE ORAS-P AVOIDANT, DEPENDENT, AND DISSONANT SCALES (RAW SCORES) BY POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE CONTACT WITH MINORITIES

Scale	Contact	n	M	SD	t	p
Avoidant	Positive:	359	7.11	2.75	-1.05	.30
	Negative:	13	7.92	3.01		
Dependent	Positive:	359	4.78	2.18	.02	.99
	Negative:	13	4.77	2.09		
Dissonant	Positive:	357	8.53	3.25	.07	.94
	Negative:	13	8.46	3.95		

As shown in Table 4, there were no differences in the group means on the ORAS-P Avoidant, Dissonant, and Dependent scales.

Research Question Four

Is there a significant difference in the racial awareness of White students who have high socio-economic status when compared to those with low socio-economic status?

A comparison of the racial awareness attitudes of student with different socioeconomic backgrounds is shown in Tables 5 - 7.

TABLE 5
COMPARISON OF MEANS ON THE ORAS-P CONFLICTIVE AND DOMINATIVE SCALES (RAW SCORES) BY ANNUAL FAMILY INCOME

Income Group	n	M	SD	F	p	Student-Newman-Keuls Post Hoc Comparison
Conflictive:						
1: less than $40,000	116	26.25	6.04	4.18	.01	< Group 4
2: $40,000-$59,999	102	27.58	5.05			
3: $60,000-$79,999	61	27.80	5.44			
4: $80,000 or more	74	29.12	5.34			> Group 1
Dominative:						
1: Less than $40,000	116	12.62	4.42	4.55	.00	< Group 3
2: $40,000-$59,999	102	13.16	4.60			
3: $60,000-$79,999	61	14.82	5.23			> Group 1
4: $80,000 or more	74	14.65	4.88			

As shown in Table 5, there was a statistically significant difference between the groups ($F=4.18$, $p = .01$) on the Conflictive Scale. The post-hoc analysis revealed that students with the highest level of family income had significantly higher scores than students with the lowest level of family income. There was also a statistically significant difference between the groups ($F=4.55$, $p< .01$) on the Dominative Scale. The post-hoc analysis revealed that students with the next to highest level of family income had significantly higher scores than students with the lowest level of family income. The results for the Integrative and Reactive Scales are shown in Table 6.

TABLE 6
COMPARISON OF MEANS ON THE ORAS-P INTEGRATIVE AND REACTIVE SCALES (RAW SCORES) BY ANNUAL FAMILY INCOME

Income Group	n	M	SD	F	p	Student-Newman-Keuls Post Hoc Comparison
integrative:						
1: Less than $40,000	116	34.46	5.40	1.79	.15	
2: $40,000-$59,999	102	33.50	4.94			
3: $60,000-$79,999	61	33.62	4.15			
4: $80,000 or more	74	32.77	5.12			
Reactive:						
1: Less than $40,000	116	18.57	4.95	2.27	.08	
2: $40,000-$59,999	102	17.36	4.12			
3: $60,000-$79,999	61	18.51	5.18			
4: $80,000 or more	74	17.15	4.28			

As shown in Table 6, there were no differences between the family income groups on the Integrative and Reactive Scales of the ORAS-P. The results for the Avoidant, Dependent and Dissonant Scales are shown in Table 7.

TABLE 7
COMPARISON OF MEANS ON THE ORAS-P AVOIDANT, DEPENDENT, AND DISSONANT SCALES (RAW SCORES) BY ANNUAL FAMILY INCOME

Income Group	n	M	SD	F	p	Student-Newman-Keuls Post Hoc Comparison
Avoidant:						
1: Less than $40,000	116	6.69	2.79	1.32	.27	
2: $40,000-$59,999	102	7.22	2.84			
3: $60,000-$79,999	61	7.38	2.67			
4: $80,000 or more	74	7.35	2.72			
Dependent:						
1: Less than $40,000	116	4.60	2.11	1.30	.27	
2: $40,000-$59,999	102	4.56	2.00			
3: $60,000-$79,999	61	5.19	2.60			
4: $80,000 or more	74	4.86	2.17			
Dissonant						
1: Less than $40,000	116	8.49	3.44	.58	.62	
2: $40,000-$59,999	102	8.37	3.22			
3: $60,000-$79,999	61	8.88	3.38			
4: $80,000 or more	74	8.14	3.27			

As shown in Table 7, there were no significant differences between the family income groups on the ORAS-P Avoidant, Dependent, or Dissonant scales.

Research Question Five

Is there a significant difference in the racial awareness of White students who graduated from a high school whose population had a high percentage of minority students and those who graduated from a high school with a low percentage of minority students?

Independent groups t-tests were used to assess differences between students who had attended high schools with a low percentage of minority enrollment (0-3%) and a high percentage of minority enrollment (4-66%). The results are shown in Table 8.

TABLE 8
COMPARISON OF MEANS ON THE ORAS-P CONFLICTIVE, DOMINATIVE, INTEGRATIVE, REACTIVE , AVOIDANT, DEPENDENT, AND DISSONANT SCALES (RAW SCORES) BY STUDENTS' HIGH SCHOOL PERCENTAGE OF MINORITY STUDENTS

Scale	High school Minority %	n	M	SD	t	p
Conflictive	Group 1: 0-3	161	27.34	5.42	-.54	.54
	Group 2: 4-66	176	27.71	5.77		
Dominative	Group 1: 0-3	161	13.38	4.36	-.45	.65
	Group 2: 4-66	176	13.61	4.92		
Integrative	Group 1: 0-3	161	33.71	4.84	-.16	.87
	Group 2: 4-66	176	33.80	4.97		
Reactive	Group 1: 0-3	161	18.35	4.38	1.36	.17
	Group 2: 4-66	176	17.68	4.64		
Avoidant	Group 1: 0-3	161	7.06	2.77	1.36	.83
	Group 2: 4-66	176	7.12	2.74		
Dependent	Group 1: 0-3	161	4.74	2.18	-.94	.93
	Group 2: 4-66	176	4.76	2.15		
Dissonant	Group 1: 0-3	160	8.57	3.36	.56	.58
	Group 2: 4-66	175	8.37	3.25		

An examination of the results shows there were no differences between group means for any of the ORAS-P scales. Students from high schools with a high percentage of minority enrollments had no higher or lower attitude scores than those from high schools with low percentages of minority enrollment.

Research Question Six

Is there a significant difference in the racial awareness of White students who have taken classes in the General Education Core Curriculum at ETSU which have a diversity component and students who have not taken those courses?

Analysis of Variance was used to determine if students who had taken more "core courses" with a diversity component would have different scores on the OARS-P than students who had taken fewer classes. The results are presented in Table 9.

TABLE 9
COMPARISON OF MEANS ON THE ORAS-P CONFLICTIVE, DOMINATIVE, INTEGRATIVE, REACTIVE, AVOIDANT, DEPENDENT, AND DISSONANT SCALES BY THE NUMBER OF CORE CLASSES TAKEN

Scale	Core Classes	n	M	SD	F	p
Conflictive	Group 1: 0-3	115	27.81	5.20	.42	.74
	Group 2: 3-5	100	27.67	5.70		
	Group 3: 6-8	135	27.76	5.88		
	Group 4: 9-13	34	26.65	5.55		
Dominative	Group 1: 0-3	115	14.02	4.54	.32	.81
	Group 2: 3-5	100	13.81	4.72		
	Group 3: 6-8	135	13.53	4.56		
	Group 4: 9-13	34	13.29	6.32		
Integrative	Group 1: 0-3	115	33.37	4.25	1.00	.39
	Group 2: 3-5	100	32.98	4.90		
	Group 3: 6-8	135	34.02	4.72		
	Group 4: 9-13	34	34.00	7.69		
Reactive	Group 1: 0-3	115	18.09	4.40	1.06	.37
	Group 2: 3-5	100	17.66	4.60		
	Group 3: 6-8	135	17.56	4.65		
	Group 4: 9-13	34	19.00	4.57		
Avoidant	Group 1: 0-3	115	7.30	2.69	.77	.51
	Group 2: 3-5	100	7.26	2.87		
	Group 3: 6-8	135	7.08	2.72		
	Group 4: 9-13	34	6.53	2.58		
Dependent	Group 1: 0-3	115	4.84	2.17	.41	.75
	Group 2: 3-5	100	4.57	2.10		
	Group 3: 6-8	135	4.85	2.16		
	Group 4: 9-13	34	4.85	2.26		
Dissonant	Group 1: 0-3	115	8.57	3.22	.22	.88
	Group 2: 3-5	100	8.47	3.38		
	Group 3: 6-8	135	8.51	3.33		
	Group 4: 9-13	34	8.06	3.16		

The results show there were no differences between group means for any of the ORAS-P scales. Students who had taken more "core courses" with had no higher or lower attitude scores than those who had taken fewer such courses.

Research Question Seven

To what extent can demographic, socio-economic, and academic factors predict students' racial awareness?

In order to answer this question, a hierarchical multiple regression was performed to analyze the effects of the independent variables on the dependent variables. For the purposes of this study, the hierarchical multiple regression was a three-step process. The first step tested the effect of the demographic variables of age and gender on the ORAS-P scales (dependent variables). Step two tested for the effects of the demographic variables and the socioeconomic variables of income, positive/negative contact, and high school percentage of minority students on the dependent variables. The final step tested for the effects of the demographic, socioeconomic, and academic variables (student classification and number of core classes completed at ETSU) on the dependent variables.

Table 10 shows a comparison of the demographic, socioeconomic, and academic independent variables on the ORAS-P Conflictive scale (raw scores).

TABLE 10
HIERARCHICAL MULTIPLE REGRESSION ANALYSIS OF THE EFFECTS OF INDEPENDENT VARIABLES ON THE ORAS-P CONFLICTIVE SCALE

	Demographic Predictors			Demographic and Socio-economic Predictors			Demographic Socioeconomic and Academic Predictors		
	b	Beta	p	b	Beta	p	b	Beta	p
Demographic Variables									
Age	-.11	-.11	.03*	-.06	-.05	.38	-.06	-.05	.46
Gender	-1.92	-.16	.00*	-1.66	-.14	.01*	-1.51	-.13	.02*
Socioeconomic Variables									
Income				.89	.18	.00*	.82	.17	.00*
Contact				-7.14	-.21	.00*	-7.13	-.22	.00*
HS minority %				-.03	-.05	.39	-.02	-.66	.51
Academic Variables									
Classification							-.13	.07	.310
Core classes							.21	.02	.802
	R^2 =.04 F =7.83 p=.000			R^2 =.12 F =7.54 p=.000			R^2 =.11 F =4.99 p=.000		

*Statistically significant at the .05 level

As shown in Table 10, age and gender explained 4% of the variance in the scores on the ORAS-P Conflictive scale. An examination of the Beta Weight for age (- .11) indicates that as the respondents age decreased, so did the Conflictive type attitudes. For the hierarchical multiple regression, the variable of gender was coded "males=0, females =1". The negative regression coefficient (Beta) for gender (- .16) indicates that males had more Conflictive type attitudes than females. With the addition of the socioeconomic variables of income, positive/negative contact, and high school percentage of minority students, the percentage of variance (R^2) increased to 12%. This indicates that demographic variables plus socioeconomic variables had more impact on the dependent variable (in this instance Conflictive type attitudes) than demographic variables alone. Three independent variables were statistically significant: gender (p= .01), income (p= .02), and contact (p= .00). The positive regression coefficient for income (.18) indicates that students with high annual family incomes had more Conflictive type attitudes than students with low annual family income. The regression coefficient for contact (- .21) indicates that students who reported having negative contact with minorities had more Conflictive type attitudes than

students who reported having positive contact with minorities. With the addition of academic variables to the regression, the percentage of variance decreased to 11%, indicating that academic variables did not increase the effects of the independent variables on the dependent variable. However, gender (p= .02), income (p= .00), and contact (p= .00) continued to have a statistically significant effect on students' Conflictive scores.

Table 11 shows a hierarchical multiple regression analysis of the effects of the independent variables on the ORAS-P Dominative scale (raw scores).

TABLE 11
HIERARCHICAL MULTIPLE REGRESSION ANALYSIS OF THE EFFECTS OF INDEPENDENT VARIABLES ON THE ORAS-P DOMINATIVE SCALE

	Demographic Predictors			Demographic and Socio-economic Predictors			Demographic Socioeconomic and Academic Predictors		
	b	Beta	p	b	Beta	p	b	Beta	p
Demographic Variables									
Age	-.08	-.09	.09	.03	.03	.58	-.03	-.03	.67
Gender	-1.60	-.16	.00*	-1.47	-.16	.01*	-1.48	-.16	.00*
Socioeconomic Variables									
Income				.73	.18	.00*	.64	.16	.00*
Contact				-7.00	-.26	.00*	-6.99	-.26	.00*
HS minority %				-.06	-.14	.02*	-.06	-.13	.02*
Academic Variables									
Classification							.59	.06	.37
Core classes							-.17	-.12	.08
	R^2 =.03			R^2 =.15			R^2 =.15		
	F =6.60			F =9.68			F =6.99		
	p=.00			p=.00			p=.00		

*Statistically significant at .05

As Table 11 shows, the demographic variables accounted for 3% of the variance in the scores on the Dominative scale. The independent variable of gender is statistically significant (p= .00). The Beta coefficient (- .16) indicates that males had more Dominative type attitudes than females. With the addition of the socioeconomic variables, the percentage of variance was increased to 15%. Gender was still statistically significant (p= .01) and the socioeconomic variables of income (p= .00), contact (p=.00), and high school minority percentage (p=.02) are also statistically significant. An examination of the Beta

coefficients of the socioeconomic variables showed that for income (.18) the higher the annual family income the more Dominative types of attitudes are expressed by students. The negative Beta coefficient for the variable of contact indicated that the more instances of negative contact with minorities, the more Dominative type attitudes were expressed. Similarly, the negative regression coefficient for the percentage of high school minority members indicated that the fewer minority members in a given high school, the more Dominative type attitudes were expressed. When academic variables were included in the regression, the percentage of variance remained at 13% indicating that academic variables had no additional effect on the scores on the Dominative scale.

Table 12 provides an analysis of the effects of the independent variables on the ORAS-P Integrative scale (raw scores).

TABLE 12
HIERARCHICAL MULTIPLE REGRESSION ANALYSIS OF THE EFFECTS OF INDEPENDENT VARIABLES ON THE ORAS-P INTEGRATIVE SCALE

	Demographic Predictors			Demographic and Socio-economic Predictors			Demographic Socioeconomic and Academic Predictors		
	b	Beta	p	b	Beta	p	b	Beta	p
Demographic Variables									
Age	.05	.06	.25	-.06	-.06	.29	-.03	-.03	.70
Gender	.97	.09	.06	.50	.05	.36	.40	.04	.47
Socioeconomic Variables									
Income				-.68	-.16	.00*	-.61	-.15	.01*
Contact				9.40	.33	.00*	9.43	.34	.00*
HS minority %				.04	.08	.17	.03	.07	.26
Academic Variables									
Classification							-.33	-.03	.63
Core classes							.14	.09	.17
	R^2 =.01			R^2 =.14			R^2 = .15		
	F =2.40			F =9.41			F =6.67		
	p=.09			p=.00			p=.000		

*Statistically significant at .05

As indicated in Table 12, demographic variables accounted for 1% of the variance in scores on the ORAS-P Integrative scale. With the addition of socioeconomic variables, the effects of the independent variables on the Integrative scale increased to 14%, with the variables of income (p=.00) and

contact (p=.00) having a statistically significant effect on student scores on the Integrative scale. The regression coefficient of the variable of income (- .16) indicates that as income decreases, more Integrative type attitudes are expressed. The regression coefficient for the variable of contact indicates that as instances of positive contact increase, so do the Integrative type attitudes. When academic predictor variables were included in the regression, the amount of variance in the scores on the Integrative scale attributed to the independent variables was 15% with income (p=.01) and contact (p=.00) continuing to have a statistically significant impact.

The effects of independent variables on the ORAS-P Reactive scale (raw scores) are shown in Table 13.

TABLE 13
HIERARCHICAL MULTIPLE REGRESSION ANALYSIS OF THE EFFECTS OF INDEPENDENT VARIABLES ON THE ORAS-P REACTIVE SCALE

	Demographic Predictors			Demographic and Socio-economic Predictors			Demographic Socioeconomic and Academic Predictors		
	b	Beta	p	b	Beta	p	b	Beta	p
Demographic Variables									
Age	.05	.06	.25	.06	.07	.28	.10	.10	.15
Gender	1.25	.13	.01*	.84	.09	.15	.60	.06	.31
Socioeconomic Variables									
Income				-.33	-.08	.19	-.29	-.07	.26
Contact				2.26	.08	.18	2.51	.09	.13
HS minority %				-.01	-.03	.61	-.02	-.05	.41
Academic Variables									
Classification							.11	.07	.31
Core classes							-1.79	-.18	.02*
	R^2 =.02			R^2 =.03			R^2 =.04		
	F =4.10			F =1.76			F =1.79		
	p=.02			p=.122			p=.09		

*Statistically significant at .05

As observed in Table 13, demographic variables accounted for 2% of the variance in scores on the ORAS-P Reactive scale. The independent variable of gender had a statistically significant effect on the dependent variable (p= .01). The positive Beta coefficient (.13) indicated that females expressed more Reactive type attitudes than males. With the addition of socioeconomic variables, the percentage of variance became 3%. However, none of the combined types of variables had a statistically significant

impact on the scores on the Reactive scales. When academic variables were added to the regression, the percentage of variance increased to 4%. There was only one independent variable that had a statistically significant impact on the dependent variable in this model: the variable of core classes (p= .02). The Beta coefficient indicated that the more core classes complete at ETSU the less Reactive type attitudes they express.

Table 14 presents the analysis of the effects of independent variables on the ORAS-P Avoidant scale (raw scores).

TABLE 14
HIERARCHICAL MULTIPLE REGRESSION ANALYSIS OF THE EFFECTS OF INDEPENDENT VARIABLES ON THE ORAS-P AVOIDANT SCALE

	Demographic Predictors			Demographic and Socio-economic Predictors			Demographic Socioeconomic and Academic Predictors		
	b	Beta	p	b	Beta	p	b	Beta	p
Demographic Variables									
Age	-.05	-.10	.04*	-.04	-.08	.23	-.06	-.09	.19
Gender	-.45	-.08	.12	-.55	-.09	.11	-.57	-.10	.11
Socioeconomic Variables									
Income				.09	.04	.54	.06	.03	.68
Contact				-.85	-.05	.40	-.79	-.05	.43
HS minority %				-.02	-.06	.34	.06	-.05	.47
Academic Variables									
Classification							-.05	-.00	.32
Core classes							-.06	-.07	.99
	R^2 =.02 F =3.24 p=.04			R^2 =.03 F =1.53 p=.18			R^2 =.03 F =1.34 p=.23		

*Statistically significant at .05

As Table 14 indicates, 2% of the variance on the ORAS-P Avoidant scale scores can be attributed to demographic variables. The demographic variable of age was statistically significant (p= .04). An examination of the Beta coefficient of the variable of age (-.10) indicated that as age increased,

fewer Avoidant type attitudes were expressed. With the addition of socioeconomic variables, the percentage of variance that could be attributed to the independent variables was 3%. However, none of the variables had a statistically significant impact on the dependent variable. The percentage of variance did not change when the academic variables were added to the regression model. Nor did any of the independent variables have a statistically significant effect on the scores of the ORAS-P Avoidant scale.

An analysis of the effects of independent variables on the ORAS-P Dependent scale (raw scores) is presented in Table 15.

TABLE 15
HIERARCHICAL MULTIPLE REGRESSION ANALYSIS OF THE EFFECTS OF INDEPENDENT VARIABLES ON THE ORAS-P DEPENDENT SCALE

	Demographic Predictors			Demographic and Socio-economic Predictors			Demographic Socioeconomic and Academic Predictors		
	b	Beta	p	b	Beta	p	b	Beta	p
Demographic Variables									
Age	.03	.07	.17	.06	.16	.01*	.04	.08	.22
Gender	.41	.09	.08	.39	.09	.13	.35	.08	.18
Socioeconomic Variables									
Income				.17	.09	.13	.14	.07	.24
Contact				.40	.03	.60	.43	.04	.57
HS minority %				-.02	-.08	.20	-.01	-.06	.34
Academic Variables									
Classification							.10	.02	.76
Core classes							.01	.01	.85
	R^2 =.01 F =2.51 p=.08			R^2 =.04 F =2.10 p=.07			R^2 = .02 F = .88 p=.52		

*Statistically significant at .05

As Table 15 shows, R^2 for demographic variables was 1%. In other words, demographic variables accounted for 1% of the variance in the scores on the ORAS-P Dependent scale. Demographic and socioeconomic variables account for 4% of the variance on the Dependent scale. In this model the independent variable of age is statistically significant (p= .01). The Beta coefficient (.16) indicated that as respondent age increased so did the expression of Dependent type attitudes. Demographic, socioeconomic, and academic variables accounted for 2% of the variance on the Dependent scale.

However, in the third regression model, none of the independent variables had a statistically significant impact on the scores on the ORAS-P Dependent scale.

Table 16 contains an analysis of the effects of independent variables on the ORAS-P Dissonant scale (raw scores).

TABLE 16
HIERARCHICAL MULTIPLE REGRESSION ANALYSIS OF THE EFFECTS OF INDEPENDENT VARIABLES ON THE ORAS-P DISSONANT SCALE

	Demographic Predictors			Demographic and Socio-economic Predictors			Demographic Socioeconomic and Academic Predictors		
	b	Beta	p	b	Beta	p	b	Beta	p
Demographic Variables									
Age	.01	.00	.87	.02	.04	.66	.02	.02	.73
Gender	.94	.14	.01*	.90	.13	.03*	.83	.12	.05*
Socioeconomic Variables									
Income				-.10	-.03	.57	-.06	.18	.74
Contact				-.57	-.03	.63	-.61	-.03	.61
HS minority %				-.00	-.01	.86	-.01	.02	.81
Academic Variables									
Classification							.48	.07	.37
Core classes							-.09	-.09	.23
	R^2 =.02 F =3.72 p=.03			R^2 =.02 F =1.20 p=.31			R^2 = -.02 F =.93 p=.48		

*Statistically significant at .05

As observed in Table 19, demographic variables account for 2% of the variance in scores on the ORAS-P Dissonant scale. In this model, the independent variable gender is statistically significant (p=.01). The positive Beta coefficient (.14) indicated that females expressed more Dissonant type attitudes than males. When variables such as income, contact, and high school percentage of minority students were added to the regression, the percentage of variance remained at 2%. However, gender was still the statistically significant variable (p=.03) and the Beta coefficient remained positive (.14). When academic variables were added to the demographic and socioeconomic variables, the percentage of variance in the scores on the Dissonant scale remained at 2%. Again, gender was statistically significant (p= .05) and the positive Beta coefficient (.12) indicated that females expressed more

Dissonant type attitudes than males.

SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

An examination of the demographic characteristics of the students revealed that 141 (35.7%) were males and 254 (64.3%) were females. The sample included 53 Freshmen, 67 Sophomores, 106 Juniors, and 161 Seniors. Students graduated from high schools that had a minority population percentage ranging from 0-66;however the average high school percentage of minority members was 7.3. Since Respondents' annual family income ranged from less than $10,000 to more than $100,000 with 45% of students clustered into the $30,000 - $60,000 range. The number of core classes having a diversity component those students had taken ranged from 0-13 and the mean was 4.7.

The results of the ORAS-P indicated there was a wide range of racial awareness attitudes expressed by students at ETSU. The majority of the students appeared to have an "Achieved" level of racial awareness. The largest number of students in the "Achieved" racial awareness category expressed Reactive attitudes (82 or 21%) while the second largest number expressed Integrative attitudes (78 or 19.9%). At the same time, 66 (16.9%) expressed Dominative type attitudes and 62 (15.9%) expressed Conflictive type attitudes. In the category of Unachieved Racial Awareness, 5 (1.0%) students expressed Dissonant type attitudes, 19 (4.9%) gave answers that were inconsistent, 3 (0.8%) did not answer enough of the questions to determine their racial awareness (characterized as Undifferentiated) and 6 (1.5%) expressed Avoidant or dependent type attitudes (characterized as Unachieved). A number of students were characterized as having dual racial awareness (e.g. Conflictive/Dominative).

The results also suggest that prior contact with minority group members is related to subsequent white racial awareness. There was a statistically difference between group means on the ORAS-P Conflictive, Dominative, Integrative and Reactive scales for contact with minorities. Students who had more positive contact with minorities expressed fewer Conflictive and Dominative type attitudes (and more Integrative and Reactive type attitudes) than students who had negative contact with minorities. Positive early contacts with minority group members appear to be one factor that leads to higher levels of Integrative and Reactive attitudes, which are characteristic of greater levels of acceptance.

Surprisingly, higher levels of family income appeared to be related to the development of Conflictive and Dominative attitudes. This finding appears to run counter to much of the current literature which suggests that whites from lower incomes would have more Conflictive and Dominative attitudes. A comparison of group means by annual family income revealed that students with an annual family income of less that $40,000 expressed fewer Conflictive type attitudes than students with an annual family income of $80,000 or more. Similarly, students with an annual family income of less that $40,000 expressed fewer Dominative type attitudes than students with an annual family income of $60,000-$79,999.

It does not appear from these results that the minority composition in one's high school has a significant impact on the formation of racial awareness attitudes. A comparison of group means on the ORAS-P Conflictive, Dominative, Integrative, Reactive, Avoidant, Dependent, and Dissonant scales revealed no statistically differences between groups by the high school percentage of minorities. While this might be an artifact of the measurement procedures used to identify minority composition (i.e., "high" and "low"), the results stand in contrast to the impact of the positive contacts. Simply attending a high school with a large percentage of students from minority groups does not necessarily influence the extent of positive personal contact.

Interestingly, the findings did not suggest that enrollment in a greater number of core courses that include a diversity component were related to the development of racial awareness. There were no statistically significant differences between groups on any of the ORAS-P scales for number of core classes (with a diversity component) taken.

Finally, the hierarchical multiple regression analysis revealed that the demographic, socioeconomic, and academic variables used in this study could only be used to explain a rather small percentage of the variation in white racial awareness (approximately 15%). The results suggested that what were termed "socioeconomic" factors in this study (family income, positive contact with minority group members, and high school composition) explained more of the variation in white racial awareness than demographic or academic characteristics. Generally, college-related factors, were not significant predictors of racial awareness, except in the prediction of reactivity. Additional research is needed to further identify the factors that are related to the development of racial awareness among white students.

REFERENCES

Bennett, S. K., Atkinson, D. R., & Rowe, W. (1993, August). White racial identity: An alternative perspective. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Psychological Association, Toronto, Canada.

Bursting, N.D., & Cabello, B. (1989). Preparing teachers to work with culturally diverse students: A teacher education model. Journal of Teacher Education, 40, 9-16.

Carter, R. (1996). Exploring the complexity of racial identity attitude measures. In G. R. Sodowsky & J. C. Impara (Eds.), Multicultural assessment in counseling and clinical psychology (pp. 193-223). Lincoln, NE: Buros Institute of Mental Measurements.

Choney, S. K., & Behrens, J. T. (1996). Development of the Oklahoma racial attitudes scale preliminary form. In G. R. Sodowsky & J. C. Impara (Eds.), Multicultural assessment in counseling and clinical psychology (pp. 225-239). Lincoln, NE: Buros Institute of Mental Measurements.

Cross, W. E., Jr. (1978). Models of psychological nigrescence: A literature review. Journal of Black Psychology, 5, (1), 13-31.

East Tennessee State University (1997). Fact book. Johnson City, TN: Author.

Ford Foundation. (1998, October). Campus diversity initiative: National survey of voters. New York: Author.

Helms, J. E. (1996). Toward a methodology for measuring and assessing racial as distinguished from ethnic identity. In G. R. Sodowsky & J. C. Impara (Eds.) Multicultural assessment in counseling and clinical psychology (pp. 143-192), Lincoln, NE: Buros Institute of Mental Measurements.

Helms, J. E. (Ed.) (1990). Black and White racial identity: Theory, research and practice. Westport, CT: Praeger.

Kalton, G. (1983). Introduction to survey sampling. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Pedersen, P. (1988). A handbook for developing multicultural awareness. Alexandria, VA: Association for Counseling and Development.

Phinney, J. S. (1989). Stages in ethnic identity in minority adolescents. Journal of Early Adolescence, 9, 34-49.

Rowe, W., Bennett, S., & Atkinson, D. R. (1994). White racial identity models: A critique and alternative proposal. The Counseling Psychologist, 22,129-146.

Sue, D.W., & Sue, D. (1990). Counseling the culturally different. (2nd ed.). New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Thomas, C. (1971). Boys no more. Beverly Hills, CA: Glencoe Press.